

REMARKS

Introduction

Claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 11, 13, 15, 18, and 20 are hereby amended. Claims 29-34 are hereby added. Claims 5, 12, 19, and 22-28 were previously cancelled. The pending application includes claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-18, 20-21, and 29-34.

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner and his Primary Examiner for conducting an interview with Applicants' representative on April 28, 2009. A summary of the substance of the interview is reflected in the Examiner's interview summary, as well as in the following remarks.

Reconsideration of the pending application is respectfully requested in view of the following:

The Claims are Allowable over the Prior Art Because the Prior Art Fails to Disclose an XML (Extensible Markup Language) Description that is Scanned for Code fragments to be Passed to Handlers Defined for a Particular ID attribute

Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-18, and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murray et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,874,143, "Murray") in view of Boherer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,106,569, "Boherer"). Reconsideration of these rejections is respectfully requested because the prior art fails to disclose at least an extension that includes an XML (Extensible Markup Language) description, wherein the XML description is scanned for code fragments to be passed to handlers defined for a particular ID attribute, as recited.

One embodiment, as disclosed by Applicants, is a computer-based extendable application framework that includes a plurality of extensions to extend an application. See, e.g., paragraph [0020] of the Applicants' specification, as well as Fig. 1. An extension includes a set of classes programmed in an object-oriented language. See, e.g., paragraph [0020] of the Applicants' specification, as well as Fig. 1. An extension may expose and consume services associated with another extension in the plurality of extensions. See, e.g., paragraphs [0020] and [0023] of the Applicants' specification. More specifically, the services are consumed by an extension's classes. See, e.g., paragraph [0023] of the Applicants' specification. The extension may include an XML (Extensible Markup Language) description. See, e.g., Fig. 1 and paragraph [0020] of the Applicants' specification. The XML description is scanned for code fragments to be passed to handlers defined for a particular ID attribute. See, e.g., paragraph [0024] of the Applicants' specification. The computer-based extendable application framework advantageously allows extensions to create an extendable infrastructure in which other extensions can participate. See, e.g., paragraph [0024] of the Applicants' specification.

In contrast to Applicants' embodiments, none of the cited prior art is directed to a computer-based extendable application framework, as recited in claim 1. Specifically, in contrast to the cited prior art, independent claim 1 recites an extension that includes "an XML (Extensible Markup Language) description, wherein the XML description is scanned for code fragments to be passed to handlers defined for a particular ID attribute."

Murray does not disclose these features, as recited in claim 1. Rather, Murray discloses a system in which files describing the extension files are downloaded on the client. These files tell the client where the extension is to be plugged in, as well as to where to find the appropriate extension files and how to download them. The extension files are then downloaded and incorporated into the program or platform. See, e.g. Murray at Abstract. However, Murray does not disclose at least an extension that includes an XML (Extensible Markup Language) description, wherein the XML description is scanned for code fragments to be passed to handlers defined for a particular ID attribute.”

In addition, Bohrer fails to cure the deficiencies of Murray. Rather, Bohrer relates to a method of developing a software system using Object Oriented technology. Thus, Bohrer does not disclose at least an extension that includes “an XML (Extensible Markup Language) description, wherein the XML description is scanned for code fragments to be passed to handlers defined for a particular ID attribute,” as recited.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 and independent claims 8 and 15, which recite similar limitations, are allowable over the cited prior art. The remaining claims depend from claim 1, claim 8, or claim 15, and are also allowable for at least the above reasons.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request favorable action in connection with this application.

The Examiner is invited and urged to contact the undersigned to discuss any matter concerning this application.

No fee is believed to be due for this submission. Should a fee be required, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any such fee to Womble Carlyle's Deposit Account No. 09-0528.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: April 30, 2009

/s/ Kathy Takeguchi /s/
Kathy Takeguchi (Reg. No. 55,988)
Womble, Carlyle, Sandridge & Rice
P.O. Box 7037
Atlanta, GA 30357-0037
703-394-2270